UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,630	01/31/2006	Xiangping Gian	09367.0006-00000	1361

22852 7590 01/23/2007

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,630	GIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/31/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment, which included amendment to claims 20-22 and 25, filed on 1/31/2006, is made of record. Claims 1-25 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statements, filed on 3/31/2005, are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making pharmaceutically acceptable salts does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvate or solvate of the salt of compound of formula I. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1. **The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:**

The invention is drawn to compound of formula I, or a pharmaceutically acceptable solvate or solvate of pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make hydrate of compounds of formula (I) Specification has no example of solvate of the instant compounds. Specification recites solvate thereof but there is no enabling of such compounds.

The instant claims embrace 1,2,4-triazinone compounds substituted with variable groups, T, T', R_1, R_2, $R_{2'}$, R_3, R_4 and R_5.

Even a cursory calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant formula (I) based on the generic definition of alkyl., aryl heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, substituted aryl, heteroaryl, arylalkyloxy, arylalkylthio etc would result in millions of compounds. This is of course not the accurate number and the true number of compounds would far exceed this number of compounds. Thus the genus embraced in the claim 1 is too large and there is no teaching of any solvate of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of hydrate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a hydrate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is

not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometery of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to hydrates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stabile region of the hydrate. In the instant case of hydrate a similar reasoning therefore apply. Water is a solvent and hence it is held that a pertinent detail of West, which relates to solvates, is also applicable to hydrate

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of hydrates in unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note Vippagunta et al., states "Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates s and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds".

2. **The predictability or lack thereof in the art:**

Hence, the solvate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

3. **The amount of direction or guidance present:**

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not related to solvates and hydrates. There is no example of a solvate of

instant compound. One compound was shown in the example 1 of the specification which has come in contact with water and other solvent but there is no showing that instant compounds formed solvates. Hence it is clear that merely bring the compound with solvent or water does not result in solvate and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them Specication has no such direction or guidance.

4. **The presence or absence of working examples:**

There is no working example of any solvate formed. The claims are drawn to hydrate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or even hydrate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co., 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...' no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that hydrates of these compounds actually exists; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates and hydrates of these compounds exist and therefore can be made.

5. **The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:**

Specication has no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claim 1 would lead to desired solvate and hydrate of the compound of formula I. As noted above, the genus embraces over million compounds and hence the

breadth of the claim is broad. The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired hydrate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treatment of breast carcinoma, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any or all cell proliferative diseases cancer including breast cancer. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above.

The instant claims 22-24 are drawn to treating any or all cell proliferative diseases, immune disorder and inflammation in general while claim 25 is kit for the same intended use by inhibition mitotic kinesin KSP.

Claims 22-25 are reach through claims. Reach through claims , in general have a format drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and thereby reach through any or all diseases, disorders or conditions for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification. In the instant case, because of the interaction of the compound formula I with KSP kinesin, it is recited that instant compounds are useful for treating any or all prolferative diseases including cancers for which there is no adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the instant specification. The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer due to mitotic kinesin inhibition for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification at pages 1-3 and 65-67. The instant compounds are disclosed to have mitotic kinesin inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all proliferative diseases including any or all cancers for which applicants provide no competent evidence. The term prolferative disease as applied to cancer includes various cancers such as solid tumors such as skin, breast, brain, cervical carcinomas, testicular carcinomas, etc. More specifically, Cardiac: sarcoma (angiosarcoma, fibrosarcoma, rhabdomyosarcoma, liposarcoma), myxoma, rhabdomyoma, fibroma, lipoma and teratoma; Lung: bronchogenic carcinoma (squamous cell, undifferentiated

small cell, undifferentiated large cell, adenocarcinoma), alveolar (bronchiolar) carcinoma, bronchial adenoma, sarcoma, lymphoma chondromatous hamartoma, mesothelioma; Gastrointestinal: esophagus (squamous cell carcinoma, adenocarcinoma, leiomyosarcoma, lymphoma), stomach (carcinoma lymphoma, leiomyosarcoma), pancreas: (ductal adenocarcinoma, insulinoma,. glucagonoma, gastrinoma, carcinoid tumors, vipoma), small bowel (adenocarcinoma lymphoma, carcinoid tumors, Karposi's sarcoma, leiomyoma, hemangoma. Lipoma neurofibroma, fibroma), large bowel (adenocarcinoma, tubular adenoma, villous adenoma, hamartoma, leiomyoma); Genitourinary tract: kidney (adenocarcinoma Wilm's tumor (nephroblastoma), lymphoma, leukemia), bladder and urethra (squamous cell carcinoma, transitional cell carcinoma, adenocarcinoma), prostate (adenocarcinoma, sarcoma), testis (seminoma, teratoma, embryonal carcinoma, teratocacinoma choriocarcinoma, sarcoma, interstitial cell carcinoma, fibroma, fibroadenoma, adenomatoid tumors, lipoma); Liver: hepatoma (hepatocellular carcinoma), cholangiocarcinoma hepatoblastoma angiosarcoma, hepatocellular adenoma, hemangioma; Bone: osteogenic,sarcoma (osteosarcoma), fibrosarcoma, malignant fibrous histiocytoma, chondrosarcoma Ewing's sarcoma malignant lymphoma (reticulum cell sarcoma), multiple mycloma, malignant giant cell tumor chordoma, osteochronfroma (osteocartilaginous exostoses), benign chondoma, chondroblastoma chondrommyxofibroma, osteoid osteoma and giant cell tumors; Nervous system: skull (osteoma hemangioma, granuloma, xanthoma, osteitis deformans), meninges (meningioma, meningiosarcoma, gliomatosis), brain (astrocytoma, medulloblastoma

glioma, ependymoma. germinoma (pinealoma), glioblastoma multiform, oligodendroglioma schwannoma, retinoblastoma, congenital humors), spinal cord neurofibroma meningioma glioma, sarcoma); Gynecological: uterus (endometrial carcinoma), cervix (cervical carcinoma, pm-tumor cervical dysplasia), ovaries (ovarian carcinoma (serous cystadenocarcinoma, mucinous cystadenocarcinoma, unclassified carcinoma), granulosa-thecal cell tumors, Sertoli-Leydig cell tumors, dysgerminoma malignant teratoma), vulva (squamous cell carcinoma, intraepithelial carcinoma, adenocarcinoma, fibrosarcoma, melanoma), vagina (clear cell carcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma botryoid sarcoma (embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma), fallopian tubes (carcinoma); Hematologic: blood (myeloid leukemia (acute and chronic), acute lymphoblastic leukemia, chronic lymphocytic leukemia, myeloproliferative diseases, multiple myeloma, myelodysplastic syndrome), Hodgkin's disease, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (malignant lymphoma); Skin: malignant melanoma, basal cell carcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma, Karposi's sarcoma, moles dysplastic nevi, lipoma, angioma, dermatofibroma, keloids, psoriasis; and Adrenal glands: neuroblastoma. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as mitotic kinesin inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of cancers. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of cancers, such as colon, pancreatic and brain cancers are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many anti cancer compounds including Taxol.

The scope of the claims involves all of the millions of compounds of claim 1 as well as any or all cancers and any or all proliferative diseases.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the Helicobacter pylori infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

Inflammation is a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally.

The "immune disorders" are a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take,' causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There are hundreds such

diseases, which have fundamentally different mechanisms and different underlying causes. Thus, the scope of claims is extremely broad.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally.

Moreover many if not most of cancers such pancreatic cancer, colon cancer and brain cancer etc. are very difficult to treat and at present there is no known drug, which can successfully reverse the course of these cancers, despite the fact that there are many compounds which inhibit KSP kinesin. No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits.

Also see the PTO website

<<http ://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/1 pecba.htm#7>>

ENABLEMENT DECISION TREE, Example F, situation 1) which is directed to the scope of cancers. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211

USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the mitotic kinesin inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The kinesin art appears still in the experimental stage. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Haque et al. Cell Motility and Cytoskeleton, 58: 10-16, 2004, Yildiz et al., Trends in Cell Biology, 15(7):112-120, 2005 and Maliga et al., Chem. Biol. 9(9): 989-996,2002(PubMed Abstract provided). Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence

or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders/diseases that require mitotic kinesin inhibitory activity.

2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications expressed that the mitotic kinesin inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory. See Haque et al., Yildiz et al., and Maliga et al., cited above.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for r treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of mitotic kinesin inhibitors are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all cancers including those yet to be related to mitotic kinesin.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from

8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

12/17/2006